

Impurity systems fluctuating between two magnetic configurations: candidates for non Fermi-liquid behavior

A.A. Aligia and M. Balaña

Comisión Nacional de Energía Atómica

Centro Atómico Bariloche and Instituto Balseiro

8400 S.C. de Bariloche, Río Negro, Argentina

The appropriate generalization of the isotropic impurity Anderson model for valence fluctuations between two magnetic multiplets l^n and l^{n+1} is solved in the strong-coupling limit of Wilson's renormalization group for $l \leq 3$. Except in the extreme case of $j-j$ coupling, the ground state is degenerate, the impurity magnetic moment is very small and is overscreened by the conduction electrons. The strong-coupling fixed point turns out to be unstable. Thus, at low enough temperatures the physics of the systems should be governed by an intermediate coupling fixed point and non Fermi-liquid behavior is expected.

PACS numbers: 75.30.Mb, 75.20.Hr, 71.28.+d, 72.15.Qm

The Anderson model for dilute magnetic alloys and its integer valent limit, the Kondo problem, have played a decisive role in the understanding of intermediate-valence and heavy-fermion systems. The scaling behavior of these models has been established [1–4]. The low temperature properties are described by the strong-coupling fixed point, characterized by a non-magnetic ground state and Fermi-liquid behavior. These models and their extension to an arbitrary degeneracy of the magnetic configuration have been solved exactly using the Bethe ansatz [5]. The predicted thermodynamic properties are in general in good agreement with experiments in dilute systems fluctuating between one magnetic and one non-magnetic configuration [5].

The properties of systems in which both accessible configurations are magnetic are markedly peculiar. For example TmSe is the only intermediate valence compound which orders magnetically with a local magnetic moment $1.5\mu_B$ [6], much smaller than those of the $4f^{12}$ and $4f^{13}$ configurations. The compounds UPt₃ [7] and UBe₁₃ [8] also order magnetically with a magnetic moment of the order of $10^{-2}\mu_B$. The magnetic susceptibility of dilute Tm systems points towards a magnetic ground state of Tm impurities [9]. The magnetic susceptibility of the Y_{0.8}U_{0.2}Pd₃ also diverges at temperature $T \rightarrow 0$ and a finite entropy at $T = 0$, $S(0)$, is suggested by specific heat measurements [10,11]. D.L. Cox stated that the different behavior of U and Ce systems might be caused by different underlying symmetries, and constructed an Anderson-like model starting from crystal-field split levels [12]. In the limit in which only the Γ_3 non-magnetic doublet of the $4f^2$ configuration and the Γ_7 states of the excited $4f^1$ configuration are retained and also the conduction $j = 7/2$ partial-wave states are omitted, his model takes the form of the spin 1/2 two-channel Kondo problem [13]. The low-temperature properties of the overscreened multi-channel Kondo problem are characterized by an intermediate-coupling fixed point [13,14] with a non-Fermi-liquid behavior [14,15] which might be related to the marginal Fermi liquid phenomenology of the high T_C systems [16]. The spin 1/2 two-channel Kondo problem has been solved exactly [15] and is consistent with several properties observed in Y_{0.8}U_{0.2}Pd₃, such as the logarithmic divergence of the specific heat at low temperatures with a residual entropy $S(0) \sim (1/2) \ln 2$

[10]. However, other properties, such as the magnetic field dependence of the specific heat, are inconsistent with the model [11]. The same happens with some data of UBe₁₃ [12].

The study of microscopic models with non-Fermi-liquid behavior, particularly if they are relevant to real systems, is of great interest at present. In this letter we show that neglecting crystal fields, the low-temperature properties of systems fluctuating between two p, d or f configurations are characterized by an intermediate-coupling fixed point, except in the unrealistic extreme cases in which one of both hybridization channels $V_j(j = l \pm 1/2$, see below) vanishes. Unfortunately, only one V_j was retained in most previous studies of valence fluctuations between two magnetic configurations [17–21]. In particular $V_{l+1/2}V_{l-1/2} = 0$, if $j - j$ coupling (instead of the more realistic LS coupling) is assumed. Also, as we have shown elsewhere [22], there are not enough conduction electron degrees of freedom in the variational wave functions considered in Ref. [21], to capture the essential physics of Tm impurities.

The generalized Anderson model for an impurity ion in an isotropic medium can be written in the form:

$$H = H_{band} + H_{mix} + H_{ion} \quad (1)$$

The first term describes a band of extended states and we need to retain only states with the same orbital angular momentum as that of the impurity shell l

$$H_{band} = \sum_{k\mu\sigma} \epsilon_k c_{k\mu\sigma}^\dagger c_{k\mu\sigma} = \sum_{kjm} \epsilon_k c_{kjm}^\dagger c_{kjm} \quad (2)$$

where μ, σ are the orbital angular momentum projection and spin respectively. The last expression is an alternative description in terms of the total angular momentum $j = l \pm 1/2$ and its projection m . Similarly:

$$H_{mix} = V \sum_{k\mu\sigma} (f_{\mu\sigma}^\dagger c_{k\sigma} + h.c.) = V \sum_{kjm} (f_{jm}^\dagger c_{kjm} + h.c.) \quad (3)$$

where the f operators refer to impurity electrons. H_{ion} describes the impurity shell and contains all the correlations of the problem. We retain only the ground state multiplets of two neighboring l^n and l^{n+1} configurations:

$$H_{ion} = E \sum_{M_0} | J_0 M_0 \rangle \langle J_0 M_0 | + (E + \Delta) \sum_{M_1} | J_1 M_1 \rangle \langle J_1 M_1 | \quad (4)$$

where J_i , M_i are the total angular momentum and projection of the l^{n+i} configuration. We find more convenient to express the f operators in terms of the Hubbard operators $| J_0 M_0 \rangle \langle J_1 M_1 |$. When this is done H_{mix} takes the form:

$$H_{mix} = \sum_{kjmM_0M_1} V_j \langle J_0 j M_0 m | J_1 M_1 \rangle (c_{kjm}^\dagger | J_0 M_0 \rangle \langle J_1 M_1 | + h.c.) \quad (5)$$

where the $\langle J_0 j M_0 m | J_1 M_1 \rangle$ are Clebsch-Gordan coefficients. The V_j/V are not free parameters, but are determined by the particular form of the highly correlated ionic states. In the simplest case of $j-j$ coupling, it is easy to verify that for $0 \leq n \leq 2l-1$:

$$V_{l+1/2} = 0; V_{l-1/2} = V \langle J_0(l-1/2) J_0(l+1/2-n) | J_1 J_1 \rangle^{-1} \quad (6)$$

while for $2l \leq n \leq 4l+2$:

$$V_{l-1/2} = 0; V_{l+1/2} = V \langle J_0(l+1/2) J_0(3l+1/2-n) | J_1 J_1 \rangle^{-1} \quad (7)$$

Instead, using LS coupling and the Hund rules, it can be shown that [23]:

$$\frac{V_j}{V} = \frac{\sum_{\mu\sigma} L_i^z S_i^z \langle L_0 S_0 L_0^z S_0^z | J_0 J_0 \rangle \langle L_1 S_1 L_1^z S_1^z | J_1 J_1 \rangle \langle l_{\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}} \mu \sigma | j(J_1 - J_0) \rangle \langle L_0 l L_0^z \mu | L_1 l L_1^z \rangle \langle S_0 \frac{1}{2} S_0^z | S_1 S_1^z \rangle}{\langle J_0 j J_0(J_1 - J_0) | J_1 J_1 \rangle \langle L_0 l L_0(L_1 - L_0) | L_1 L_1 \rangle \langle S_0 \frac{1}{2} S_0(S_1 - S_0) | S_1 S_1 \rangle} \quad (8)$$

The result of Eq.(8) for the cases in which both l^n and l^{n+1} configurations are magnetic is given in Table I.

The integrability of the model using the Bethe ansatz has been studied by Aligia et al. [17]. When both configurations are magnetic, only the cases with $l = 1$ (see Table I) are integrable if in addition $V_{3/2} = 0$ is assumed. They were solved by the same authors [17] and by Schlottmann [5]. In the integer-valent limits $|\Delta| \gg V$, these cases are equivalent to underscreened Kondo problems [17], characterized by the same strong coupling fixed point at low temperatures as the original model [24]. The ground state has total angular momentum $\min(J_0, J_1)$. It has been shown recently that in the underscreened Kondo problem, Fermi-liquid excitations coexist with the magnetic degrees of freedom and that they are decoupled at low frequency [25].

Unfortunately, for the most realistic cases for valence fluctuations between two magnetic configurations the model is not integrable with the Bethe ansatz and also alternative, accurate enough methods used for $l = 0$, have serious practical limitations. The nature of the correlations of H_{ion} would require several different Hubbard-Stratonovich transformations for the implementation of a Monte Carlo algorithm [26], while in Wilson's renormalization group [2–4], the size of the relevant Hilbert space is enlarged by a factor 2^{4l+2} in each iteration, severely affecting the numerical accuracy for $l \neq 0$. A similar, although not so severe restriction was encountered in the renormalization group treatment of the spin 1/2 two-channel Kondo problem [14]. However, formally, Wilson's renormalization group can be implemented in the same way as for $l = 0$ [2–4]. The only difference is that the logarithmic discretized band has orbital degeneracy. We call $c_{n\mu\sigma}$ the states and destruction operators of the different onion-like spherical Wannier functions ($f_{n\mu}$ in the notation of Ref. 3). It is clear that if one starts from a small value of V , during the first few iterations the system is near the free-orbital fixed point and the effective value of V increases. If in the subsequent renormalization group flow the system does not reach a fixed point at an intermediate value of V , then, the low temperature behavior is described by the strong-coupling fixed point $V \rightarrow \infty$, as in the case of $l = 0$ [2–4] or a particular model for valence fluctuations between two magnetic configurations [24]. However, if the strong-coupling fixed point is unstable, there must exist at least one intermediate-coupling fixed point, as in the spin 1/2 two-channel Kondo model [13,14]. In this case, there are no asymptotic scattering states [14] and a non-Fermi-liquid behavior is expected.

Thus, the study of the strong-coupling fixed point might provide a clue about what kind of physics is expected in the model at low temperatures. The properties of this fixed-point are determined by the local Hamiltonian H_0 in which only the innermost Wannier functions $c_{0\mu\sigma}$ are considered and all energies are neglected compared to V [2–4]. This one-site problem is far from trivial for realistic systems. The size of the Hilbert space of H_0 is $(J_0 + J_1 + 1)2^{4l+3}$. We have found the ground state of H_0 in each subspace of a given number of particles $n + n_c$ and total angular momentum projection J_t^z , using the Lanczos method

and a modified version of it [27]. The quantum numbers of the ground state are given in Table I. They are independent of Δ and $V_{l\pm 1/2}$ as long as both $V_j \neq 0$. The cases with the same l and J_0 and J_1 interchanged are related by a special electron-hole transformation [17,22]. In general, the ground state is highly degenerate. There are states differing not only in J_t^z , but also in J_t and n_c with the ground state energy. Exceptions are the cases with $l = 3$ and $1 \leq n \leq 4$ where only one value of n_c and J_t characterizes the ground state. However, due to numerical uncertainties, we cannot completely rule out the possibility that states with other values of J_t are degenerate with the ground state in these cases.

The expectation value at the impurity magnetization $J_{imp}^z = \sum_{i,M_i} M_i | J_i M_i \rangle$ is always negative for any state of the ground state with maximum J_t^z . Some specific values are given in Ref. [28]. Thus, the impurity magnetization is overscreened. The absolute value of $\langle J_{imp}^z \rangle$ decreases when the magnitude of the V_j are changed from the ideal LS -coupling values to those corresponding to intermediate coupling, and vanishes in the $j-j$ coupling limit. In this limit the degeneracy of the ground state becomes irrelevant, since the states c_{ojm} with j such that $V_j = 0$ become decoupled. If one is almost in the $j-j$ coupling limit, say $V_{j1} \gg V_{j2}$, where V_{j2} would vanish according to Eqs. (6), (7), there will exist a regime at intermediate temperatures characterized by a fixed point in which $V_{j1} = \infty$, $V_{j2} = 0$. Our results for this fixed point agree completely with those obtained by Lustfeld for $l = 3$ and several values of n in the integer valent limit of the present model [18]. In particular the ground state is non-magnetic, in agreement also with Refs. [19,20]. However, this fixed point is unstable if $V_{j2} > 0$, and a finite though small impurity magnetic moment as found in T_m [6] and U [7,8] compounds starts to develop at lower temperatures.

For $l=1$ and $V_{3/2} = 0$ we find a ground state with $J_t = \min(J_0, J_1)$ in agreement with Bethe ansatz results [17,5] and renormalization-group calculations [24].

In the following we discuss the stability of the strong-coupling fixed point. In the immediate neighborhood of this fixed point, eliminating the potential scattering by means of the mapping explained in Ref. [3] Appendix A, section 4, the Hamiltonian has a form like:

$$H \cong H_0(V) + H'_{band} + \sum_{\mu\sigma} (c_{0\mu\sigma}^\dagger c_{1\mu\sigma} + h.c.) \quad (9)$$

where $H_0(V)$ is the problem solved above with a very large but finite V and H'_{band} represents the band without the $c_{0\mu\sigma}$ states, discussed in Section III.B.3 of Ref. [3]. In most of the present cases in which different values of n_c are present in the ground state, the operators $c_{0\mu\sigma}^+$ and $c_{0\mu\sigma}$ connect different states with the ground state energy. In each renormalization group iteration there is, by definition, an overall factor $\Lambda^{1/2}$ where $\Lambda > 1$ is the parameter of the logarithmic discretization of the band (Eq. (2.22) of Ref. 2). Also the operator $c_{1\mu\sigma}$ introduces a factor $\Lambda^{1/4}$ in each iteration (Eq. (4.23) of Ref. 2). Thus, the last term of Eq. (9) is accompanied by a factor $\Lambda^{1/4}$ and is a *relevant* operator, indicating that the strong-coupling fixed point is unstable.

The cases in which only one n_c is present in the ground state ($l=3$, $n=1$ or 2 in Table I) are more delicate, but are completely analogous to the corresponding case of the spin-1/2 two-channel Kondo model [13,14]. In these cases, the last term of Eq. (9) affects the eigenvalues of H in second order perturbation theory, leading to an effective interaction H_{eff} between the ground state of H_0 and the $c_{1\mu\sigma}$ states. Following a similar reasoning to that which led to the effective exchange Hamiltonians in the integer valent limits of the present model [17,18], one can show that H_{eff} has the form of an exchange Hamiltonian between the total angular momentum J_t of the ground state of H_0 and the c_{1jm} states. Also since the relevant denominators in the perturbative treatment should increase like V as $\Lambda^{1/2}$ on each iteration, H_{eff} is a marginal operator. Following Ref. 2, we expect that the strong-coupling fixed point is stable if the coupling constant J_{eff} of H_{eff} is negative (ferromagnetic) and unstable otherwise. A simple argument due to Nozières and Blandin [13] shows that if the impurity magnetic moment is over-(under) screened in H_0 , $J_{eff} > 0$ ($J_{eff} < 0$). Thus, the strong-coupling fixed point is also unstable.

In conclusion, valence fluctuations between two magnetic l^n and l^{n+1} configurations, except in limiting unrealistic cases in which $V_{l+1/2}V_{l-1/2} = 0$ (e.g. extreme $j-j$ coupling) are expected to be characterized by an intermediate coupling fixed point at low temperatures,

in absence of crystal field. Although the cases with $l = 1$ might look academic, they are the simplest ones to be studied by alternative methods, which we hope will follow the present study. The unrealistic case $l = 0$ has already provided a great deal of understanding of the physics of systems fluctuating between one magnetic and one non-magnetic configurations.

We would like to thank Andrei E. Ruckenstein for many enlightening discussions, and L.M. Falicov for a critical reading of the manuscript. One of us (MB) is supported by the Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones Científicas y Técnicas (CONICET). AAA is partially supported by the CONICET.

REFERENCES

- [1] P.W. Anderson, J. Phys. C **3**, 2436 (1970).
- [2] K.G. Wilson, Rev. Mod. Phys. **47**, 773 (1975).
- [3] H.R. Krishna-murthy, J.W. Wilkins, and K.G. Wilson, Phys. Rev. B **21**, 1003 (1980).
- [4] H.R. Krishna-murthy, J.W. Wilkins, and K.G. Wilson, Phys. Rev. **21**, 1044 (1980).
- [5] P. Schlottmann, Phys. Rep. **181**, 1 (1989); refeences therein.
- [6] H. Bjerrum Møller, S.M. Shapiro and R.J. Birgeneau, Phys. Rev. Lett. **39**, 1021 (1977).
- [7] G. Aeppli et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **60**, 615 (1988).
- [8] R.N. Kleiman et al., Phys. Rev. Lett **64**, 1975 (1990).
- [9] A. Berger et al., J. Phys. (Paris) Colloq **40**, C5, 364 (1979).
- [10] C.L. Seaman et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **67**, 2882 (1991).
- [11] B. Andraka and A.M. Tsvelik, Phys. Rev. Lett. **67**, 2886 (1991).
- [12] D.L. Cox, Phys. Rev. Lett. **59**, 1240 (1987).
- [13] P. Nozières and A. Blandin, J. Phys. (Paris) **41**, 193 (1980).
- [14] D.M. Cragg, P. Lloyd, and P. Nozières, J. Phys. C **13**, 803 (1980).
- [15] A.W.W. Ludwig and I. Affleck, Phys. Rev. Lett. **67**, 3160 (1991); references therein.
- [16] C.M. Varma et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **63**, 1996 (1989).
- [17] A.A. Aligia, C.A. Balseiro, and C.R. Proetto, Phys. Rev. B **33**, 6476 (1986); references therein.
- [18] H. Lustfeld, Physica B **113**, 69 (1982).
- [19] N. Read et al., J. Phys. C **19**, 1597 (1986).

- [20] A.C. Nunes, J.W. Rasul, and G.A. Gehring, J. Magn. Magn. Mater. **63-64**, 208 (1987).
- [21] Y. Yafet, C.M. Varma, and B. Jones, Phys. Rev. B **32**, 360 (1985).
- [22] M. Balaña and A.A. Aligia, Europhys. Lett. **13**, 739 (1990).
- [23] M. Balaña and A.A. Aligia, Solid State Commun. **75**, 65 (1990).
- [24] R. Allub, H. Ceva, and B. Alascio, Phys. Rev. B **29**, 3098 (1984).
- [25] J. Gan, P. Coleman, and N. Andrei, Phys. Rev. Lett. **68**, 3476 (1992).
- [26] J.E. Hirsch and R.M. Fye, Phys. Rev. Lett. **56**, 2521 (1986).
- [27] E. Dagotto and A. Moreo, Phys. Rev. B **38**, 5087 (1988); references therein.
- [28] M. Balaña and A.A. Aligia, Physica B **171**, 109 (1991).

TABLES

Parameters and ground-state quantum numbers in the strong coupling limit, for valence fluctuations between any two magnetic Hund-rules ground-state multiplets of neighboring l^n and l^{n+1} configurations with $l \leq 3$. J_i is the total angular momentum of the l^{n+i} configuration and V_j is the hybridization energy for conduction electrons with total angular momentum j , using LS coupling. The numbers in brackets are those V_j which vanish for $j - j$ coupling. The total number of particles and the total angular momentum of the local Hamiltonian H_0 , are denoted by $n + n_c$ and J_t respectively. Some cases of marginal interest with $l = 3$ were not solved.

l	n	J_0	J_1	$V_{l-1/2}/V$	$V_{l+1/2}/V$	n_c	J_t
1	3	3/2	2	(0.8165)	0.8165	2-4	0,1/2
1	4	2	3/2	(0.6455)	1.2910	3-5	0,1/2
2	1	3/2	2	1.1593	(0.5059)	3-7	0,3/2,2
2	2	2	3/2	1.0733	(0.7026)	4-8	0,3/2,2
2	5	5/2	4	(0.8944)	0.6324	5-9	0,3/2,2
2	6	4	9/2	(0.9083)	0.9710	4-8	0,3/2,2
2	7	9/2	4	(0.7817)	1.2536	3-7	0,3/2,2
2	8	4	5/2	(0.5477)	1.5492	2-6	0,3/2,2
3	1	5/2	4	1.2234	(0.4666)	8	15/2
3	2	4	9/2	1.1848	(0.6971)	8	8
3	3	9/2	4	1.0853	(0.8514)	7	8
3	4	4	5/2	0.9587	(0.9141)	7	15/2
3	7	7/2	6	(0.9258)	0.5345	7-13	0,3/2,2,5/2,4,9/2
3	8	6	15/2	(1.0059)	0.8138		
3	9	15/2	8	(0.9647)	1.0362		
3	10	8	15/2	(0.8612)	1.2334		
3	11	15/2	6	(0.7058)	1.4275		

3	12	6	7/2	(0.4818)	1.6690	2-8	0,3/2,2,5/2,4,9/2
---	----	---	-----	----------	--------	-----	-------------------
